



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE | | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/042,082 | 42,082 01/07/2002 | | Christopher Michael Abernathy | AUS920010807US1 6560 | |
| | 7590 | 06/06/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| Gregory W. Carr | | | | CHEN, TSE W | |
| Carr & Storm, L.L.P. 670 Founders Square | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 900 Jackson S | | | 2116 | | |
| Dallas, TX | 75202 | | | DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/042,082 | ABERNATHY ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Tse Chen | 2116 | | |

| Potoro the Eiling of an Annual Priot | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | | |
| | Tse Chen | 2116 | | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | orrespondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>23 May 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | | |
| | b) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the man rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no | | | | | | | |
| event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the safter the mailing date of the final rejection | The appropriate extensio final Office action; or (2) on, even if timely filed, ma | on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) ly reduce any | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | | |
| | (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). | illowable if submitted in a separate | , timely filed amendm | ient canceling | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | ill be entered and an | explanation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: | | | • | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented. S | al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(| ils to provide a 1). | | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: | | | | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other: | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper | No(s). | | | | | | |
| _ | · | UPERVISORY PATEI TECHNOLOGY CEI | | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant raised new issues that would require further consideration and/or search by amending the claims with the limitation to "selectively disable only the first clock... or disable only the second clock".